Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 14 1972
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1971

No. ..... 71 - 922

HERBERT J. COHN,

Petitioner,

against

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JOSEPH BRILL,
Attorney for Petitioner,
10 East 40th Street,
New York, N. Y. 10016.

JOSEPH BRILL,
JACOB W. FRIEDMAN,
of Counsel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Opinion Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented for Review	2
Statement of Case	2
Reasons for Allowance of Writ	3
Conclusion	8
Appendix:	
Opinion of United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Dated December 17, 1971	1a

Cases Cited

Bennett v. District Court, 81 Okla. 351, 162 P. 2d 561	4
Paternostro v. United States (C. A. 5) 311 F. 2d 294	6
Rivers v. State, 121 Fla. 887, 164 So. 544	4
United States v. Alo (C. A. 2) 439 F. 2d 751	5
United States v. Essex (C. A. 6) 407 F. 2d 214	5
United States v. Neff (C. A. 3) 212 F. 2d 29	6
United States v. Rose (C. A. 3) 215 F. 2d 617	6
United States v. Silverman (C. A. 2) 248 F. 2d 671	4

Statutes Cited

	PAGE
18 U. S. Code	
Sec. 1503	2, 4
Sec. 1621	2, 4
Sec. 3282	3
28 U. S. Code	
Sec. 1254	2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971

HERBERT J. COHN,

Petitioner,

against

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

To the Honorable the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Your petitioner Herbert J. Cohn, by his attorney, Joseph Brill, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review a determination of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, rendered December 17, 1971, affirming a judgment of conviction in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The latter judgment had been rendered on August 16, 1971, after trial before Pollack, D. J., and a jury. The crimes of which petitioner was convicted were perjury and the obstruction of justice (18 U. S. Code Secs. 1621 and 1503 respectively). The indictment contained another perjury count, of which petitioner was acquitted. The sentence imposed on each count (concurrently) was imprisonment for one year and a fine of $2,500, with execution of sentence suspended except for sixty days, the remainder being a period of probation.

Opinion Below

A copy of the opinion of the Court of Appeals (by Kaufman, Circ. J.), affirming the judgment of conviction is appended hereto.

Jurisdiction

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on December 17, 1971.

The jurisdiction of the United States District Court was invoked as involving alleged violations of 18 U. S. Code Secs. 1621 and 1503.

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States is invoked under 28 U. S. Code Sec. 1254.

Questions Presented for Review

Where the alleged perjurious testimony relates to events occurring more than seven years prior to the grand jury inquiry, so that any prosecution as to the subject-matter is barred by limitations, may the testimony still be deemed so material as to justify a prosecution for perjury?

Does the alleged giving of false testimony before a grand jury come within the purview of the statute relating to obstruction of justice?

Does the mere testimony of a handwriting expert on a collateral point constitute such corroboration as to sustain a perjury conviction?

Statement of Case

The background, as stated by the Government in its brief below, was simply this: "The grand jury, which heard the defendant testify on four different occasions under a

formal grant of immunity, was investigating possible corruption involving government and labor union officials." While testifying on April 29, 1970, petitioner is charged with having given false answers to some seven questions. In substance he stated that he had no recollection of and could not identify the handwriting on a certain envelope bearing a postmark of March 27, 1963 (384; subsequent numerical references relate to pages of the transcript). The Government's proof consisted of the testimony of one Herbert Itkin that petitioner had given him the envelope; and the contradicted statement of a handwriting expert that in his opinion part of the writing on the envelope was that of petitioner's wife.

Reasons for Allowance of Writ

1. The subject-matter of the grand jury inquiry (as specifically contained in the indictment herein) was outlawed by limitations. The essence of all the offense charged to petitioner and whereof he was convicted was his declaration of inability to recall or recognize a few words scribbled on an envelope more than seven years prior to his interrogation before the grand jury. Were it to be assumed that the notes were in some way significant, it is manifest that on the day of his testimony, namely, April 29, 1970, the grand jury could not lawfully indict any one in consequence of what was written (or even done) in 1963. With the exception of capital crimes, the limitation for federal prosecutions is five years. 18 U. S. Code Sec. 3282. Clearly, even if the note or memorandum contained (instead of its equivocal language) a forthright admission of larceny or bribery in violation of some pertinent federal law, and the grand jury was seeking to establish the identity of the writer, the false testimony of a witness that he did not recognize the writing, could not ground either a perjury or obstruction prosecution. Where any indictment for the original transaction is barred by limitations, any testimony

relating to it automatically becomes immaterial. The perjury statute (18 U. S. Code Sec. 1621) is limited to "material matter," and false testimony concerning matters not material to a grand jury's investigation cannot constitute perjury. *Rivers* v. *State*, 121 Fla. 887, 164 So. 544; *Bennett* v. *District Court*, 81 Okla. 351, 162 P. 2d 561. Consequently, matters occurring prior to the limitations period, however cogent, become immaterial in any prosecution. *United States* v. *Silverman* (C. A. 2) 248 F. 2d 671. The Government's justification for the remote inquiry was that the answers "would have surely provided the grand jury with necessary and valuable leads." We submit that the approval of such procedure would permit the scope of any alleged investigation to extend back into the most distant past and sanction a prying into matters wholly foreign to the grand jury's proper functions.

2. The indictment's allegations under count 3 (obstruction of justice) are identical with those of count 2 (perjury). The acts imputed to petitioner may not possibly come within the ambit of 18 U. S. Code Sec. 1503. That law's very caption ("Influencing or injuring officer, juror or witness generally") is indicative of its scope, and the conclusion is confirmed by a precise study of every word. Various acts are enumerated, to wit, threatening or intimidating a witness in a federal court or before a federal magistrate; threatening or intimidating a grand or petit juror; injuring a party or witness on account of his testifying; injuring a juror, magistrate or officer on account of the performance of his official duties; and, finally, renders criminal the act of one who "corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice." Nothing in the statute contains the slightest of a legislative intent to include perjury. In order to be guilty of

obstruction of justice, a defendant must be shown to have done so corruptly, by threats or force or by a threatening letter or communication, and most certainly not by the giving of false testimony. A recent decision specifically holds that neither the language of the statute nor its purpose makes the giving of false testimony an obstruction, or an attempt to obstruct justice. *United States* v. *Essex* (C. A. 6) 407 F. 2d 214. The Government virtually admitted that its position was not sustained by the *Essex* decision, saying with respect thereto in its brief below, "There the Court rejected the broad reading of Section 1503 adopted in this Circuit." In the instant case the Court of Appeals reiterated views previously expressed in *United States* v. *Alo* (C. A. 2) 439 F. 2d 751, and thus we are confronted with a clear conflict between two circuits—a classic situation calling for final authoritative review.

We may add that the instructions to the jury herein, to the extent that they related to the obstruction count, purported to read the statute "in pertinent part" (405-407) and completely omitted its very beginning, namely, "Whoever corruptly influences, obstructs or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct or impede the due administration of justice commits an offense," adding, however, "I also charge you as a matter of law that obstruction of justice includes concealing from a grand jury information relevant and germane to its functions." Wholly apart from such language's extension of the statute to transactions not within its language or intent, it is obvious that an authoritative direction to the jury to evaluate a charge of obstructing justice in conjunction with the perjury count necessarily affected impartial consideration of the latter. It is not asking too much to require that a defendant charged with perjury is entitled to a trial on that issue alone, free from the concomitant prejudice inherent in a characterization of the matter as an obstruction of justice.

3. The Government's proof fell far short of the required corroboration essential to establish the commission of perjury. Indeed, it is our contention that there was an utter lack of corroboration. The law is well established that in the federal courts the alleged false statements must be proved either by the testimony of two independent witnesses, or by one witness plus independent corroborating evidence. *Paternostro* v. *United States* (C. A. 5) 311 F. 2d 294; *United States* v. *Neff* (C. A. 3) 212 F. 2d 29; *United States* v. *Rose* (C. A. 3) 215 F. 2d 617. This rule was recognized by the trial Court herein and included in the instructions (400). On the two counts on which petitioner was convicted the sole witness as to the delivery by petitioner of the envelope to Herbert Itkin was Itkin himself. We cannot forbear mentioning the type of individual with whom we are concerned at this point. The Government's sole material witness, Itkin, admitted having threatened F. B. I. agents (82); admitted being party to a hundred kickback deals running into millions of dollars (86-88); admitted numerous other criminal acts, including the conversion of clients' funds (88), bribery of public officials (89), the commission of perjury, for which at the time of the present trial he was under indictment (90), the filing of a false report (91), participation in the theft of several million dollars (93), making false affidavits and false tax returns (94-96), the misappropriation of escrow moneys (99) and trust funds (101) and numerous other misdeeds. Even the prosecutor could not forbear referring to him in summation as one who "freely admitted deals and bribes" and one who "became publicly known as an informant (377-378). Recently the New York Times referred on its first page (November 10, 1971) to "Herbert Itkin, the self-described Federal informant," and called him "the key figure in more than half a dozen major Federal cases prosecuted here over the last three years"—not all of which resulted

in convictions. If there has ever been an individual of whose character courts may take judicial notice, Itkin may well come within that category.

With such a witness as the mainstay of its case, the prosecution clearly had the burden of coming forward with another witness or independent corroborating proof. There was no other witness as to the dealings between petitioner and Itkin. All the Government could offer as supposed corroboration was the testimony of a handwriting expert, one Davis, who expressed the opinion that three words on the crucial exhibit (Govt. Ex. 7), namely "embezzlement," "indictment" and "O'Brien," were in the same handwriting as another paper written by petitioner's wife. However, he was unable (173) to reach a definite opinion as to "the remainder of the penciled script writing on this Government Exhibit 7." And the opinion of Davis was squarely contradicted by that of J. R. Haring, the prominent handwriting expert called by the defense (323-324). Even if it be assumed that the Davis opinion was quite correct, and that the words on the envelope were written by petitioner's wife, no distortion of reasoning could elevate such testimony to the status of corroboration of the charge that defendant was untruthful in testifying that he was unable to recognize the handwriting. A person who says he does not know whether a scrap of paper with which he is confronted was written by his wife seven years ago, is not shown to be committing perjury because some one is of the opinion that part of the paper is in the person's wife's handwriting. This piece of proof—the opinion of a handwriting expert—is so plainly remote and fragmentary, as not coming close to the law's requirement of corroboration. If such minutiae are to be invested with the dignity of corroboration, there is no limit to the peripheral and insignificant matters upon which reliance will be placed in the future, and we would in effect be abandoning the sound rule as to the minimal elements of proof of perjury.

While petitioner herein is naturally pursuing all remedies to exonerate him of wrongdoing, and in the strongest feeling of his complete innocence, which his counsel shares, the Court will appreciate that the case involves meritorious and certainly arguable questions of a kind likely to arise in other prosecutions and calling for authoritative disposition—especially in view of the contrary view expressed in another circuit. The issues are of a sort with which courts are likely to be concerned in future cases. Ultimate appellate review would be most helpful in furnishing sound guidelines to aid in the just resolution of similar controversies and to prevent injustice.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, your petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to the end that this cause may be reviewed and determined by this Court; that the determination, order and judgment of the said Court of Appeals may be reversed, and that petitioner be granted such other, further and different relief as may seem proper.

Dated New York, N. Y., January 12, 1972.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH BRILL,
Attorney for Petitioner,
10 East 40th Street,
New York, N. Y. 10016.

JOSEPH BRILL,
JACOB W. FRIEDMAN,
of Counsel.

APPENDIX

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Dated December 17, 1971

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 387—September Term, 1971.

(Argued December 14, 1971 Decided December 17, 1971)

Docket No. 71-1884

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

HERBERT J. COHN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Before:

SMITH, KAUFMAN and MULLIGAN,

Circuit Judges.

KAUFMAN, *Circuit Judge:*

Herbert J. Cohn appeals from a conviction for committing perjury (18 U.S.C. §1621) and obstructing justice (18 U.S.C. §1503). We affirm.

The indictment charged that he gave "false and evasive" testimony before a federal Grand Jury.[1] Cohn argues that his perjury conviction must be set aside because his testimony was not material to the grand jury investigation and there was no independent corroboration of the testimony of the principal government witness. In addition,

[1] A third count charged Cohn with perjury unrelated to this Grand Jury testimony. He was acquitted on this count.

he urges that false and evasive testimony will not support a conviction for obstructing justice.

On April 29, 1969, Cohn appeared under a formal grant of immunity before a federal Grand Jury investigating possible corruption among government and labor union officials. Confronted with an envelope addressed to his son on which there were pencilled notes such as "indictment," "embezzlement," "5 Count GJ," and "Buffalino Father in Law," he gave the following pertinent answers in response to questions relating to the envelope:

> Q. Mr. Cohn, I show you what has been marked Grand Jury Exhibit 1 and ask you whether you can identify that and whether you have ever seen it before? A. I don't recall any of this. I recognize the envelope. It was addressed to my son. I recognize the handwriting addressing it to my son as coming from my mother. It must have been a birthday card or something.
>
> Q. Do you recognize the pencilled handwriting? A. There are several here.
>
> Q. Do you recognize any of them? A. Offhand—I can't say that I do.
>
> * * *
>
> Q. You never recall seeing that envelope? A. No. This is the first time I have seen it.
>
> Q. You are sure of that? A. I don't recall ever seeing this thing. I don't know where it comes from or what it is all about.
>
> Q. Does anything that is written on there refresh your recollection concerning anything you might know about? A. The only name that I see here, as I said, I knew was Buffalino. I can't make out this

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Dated December 17, 1971

and I don't understand what the connection is, anyway.

Q. Well, aside from specific names, is there anything in the information that is written on there that would in any way jog your memory as to whether you know anything about what is written on there? A. I don't have any recollection of the envelope or any of this.

At trial, Herbert Itkin testified that Cohn was the middle man in late 1962 and early 1963 between himself and Morris Emmanuel, a Labor Department official, in an illegal scheme to obtain information concerning pending federal labor racketeering investigations. Cohn, according to Itkin, gave him the envelope in question and told him that the pencilled notes, written by his wife, contained the information he had received from Emmanuel. An FBI handwriting expert testified that some of the notes on the envelope were written by Cohn's wife and that others contained significant similarities to her handwriting. Cohn in his testimony at the trial denied that he had given the envelope to Itkin and reaffirmed his Grand Jury testimony.

We need not pause long in considering Cohn's challenge to the perjury conviction on the grounds that his testimony, relating as it did to events which had occurred prior to the limitations period, could not be a basis for indictment. He argues that as a matter of law it could not pertain to a "material matter."[2] The Grand Jury's scope of inquiry, however, is not limited to events which themselves may result in criminal prosecution, but is prop-

[2] One can be prosecuted for perjury only if he testifies falsely to "any material matter." 18 U.S.C. §1621.

erly concerned with any evidence which may afford valuable leads for investigation of suspected criminal activity during the limitations period. "[T]he test of materiality is whether the false testimony has the natural effect or tendency to impede, influence or dissuade the grand jury from pursuing its investigation." *United States* v. *Stone*, 429 F.2d 138, 140 (2d Cir. 1970). Here, by concealing information relating to Emmanuel's suspected unlawful dealings in 1962 and 1963, Cohn may have hindered an investigation into Emmanuel's subsequent activities as a Labor Department official.[3]

We also find lacking in merit Cohn's challenge to his conviction for perjury on the ground that the evidence did not satisfy the "two-witness rule." Perjury can be proven by two witnesses or by the testimony of one witness corroborated by independent evidence. *See, e.g., United States* v. *Manfredonia*, 414 F.2d 760, 764 (2d Cir. 1969); *United States* v. *Marchisio*, 344 F. 2d 653, 664 (2d Cir. 1965). Itkin's testimony was sufficiently corroborated by the testimony of the FBI handwriting expert and the inferences to be drawn from the contested notes on the envelope, as well as by the very possession of this envelope by Itkin.

Cohn also argues that his testimony, even if it concealed information relevant and germane to the Grand Jury's functions,[4] will not support a conviction under 18 U.S.C. 1503 for obstructing justice. Although the specific provisions of 1503 relate to tampering, by corruption, threats

[3] Emmanuel continued as an official of the Labor Department until 1968.

[4] The district judge charged as a matter of law "that obstruction of justice includes concealing from a grand jury information relevant and germane to its functions."

or force, with sources of evidence extrinsic to the actor, the final all-embracive language proscribes all conduct which "corruptly . . . influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, . . ." Cohn would have us limit the scope of this clause only to situations where the defendant interferes with other witnesses or documentary evidence. We rejected this argument under 18 U.S.C. §1505, which tracks the language of §1503 in the context of administrative proceedings, in *United States* v. *Alo*, 439 F.2d 751, 754 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 40 L.W. 3164 (Oct. 12, 1971):

> So restrictive a gloss, however, would produce the anomalous result that concealing information recorded in one's papers would constitute, as the appel-

[5] 18 U.S.C. §1503 provides:

> Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness, in any court of the United States or before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, or any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, in the discharge of his duty, or injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such court or examination before such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or injures any such grand or petit juror in his person or property on account of any verdict or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or injures any such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate in his person or property on account of the performance of his official duties, or corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

> lant concedes, an offense under §1505, but concealing data recorded in one's memory would not. No rational basis for differentiating between these two types of evidence has been suggested to us, and without a clear statement of contrary Congressional intent we cannot attribute such an arbitrary distinction to the legislature. Like the specific provisions which precede it [*e.g.*, §1503], §1505 deals with the deliberate frustrations through the use of corrupt or false means of an agency's attempt to gather relevant evidence. The blatantly evasive witness achieves this effect as surely by erecting a screen of feigned forgetfulness as one who burns files or induces a potential witness to absent himself.
>
> Alo objects that such an interpretation of §1505 will open an avenue for wholesale evasion of the so-called "two-witness rule" to which perjury convictions must conform. We disagree. It is true, that to convict Alo the jury had to conclude that he was lying when he professed loss of memory, but the gist of his offense was not the falsehood of his statements, but the deliberate concealment of his knowledge.

We see no reason to depart from this reasoning.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

No. 71-922

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971

HERBERT J. COHN, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
Solicitor General
HENRY E. PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
KIRBY W. PATTERSON,
Attorneys,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C. 20530.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971

No. 71-922

HERBERT J. COHN, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals is not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on December 17, 1971. The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on January 14, 1972. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

456-618 72 - 1

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether grand jury testimony relating to events more than six years before the date of inquiry was material to the grand jury's inquiry.

2. Whether the evidence against petitioner was sufficient under the standard applicable to perjury prosecutions.

3. Whether false testimony before a grand jury constitutes an obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. 1503.

STATEMENT

After a trial by jury in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, petitioner was convicted of perjury and obstruction of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1621 and 1503. The district court fined petitioner $2,500 on each of two counts, imposed concurrent sentences of imprisonment for one year, suspended the sentences except for sixty days' imprisonment, and placed petitioner on probation for two years. The court of appeals affirmed (Pet. App. 1–6).

In 1970, a grand jury in the Southern District of New York was investigating possible corruption involving government and labor union officials, including the misuse of welfare and pension funds of various unions, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1954 and other statutes. The grand jury questioned petitioner, who had been granted immunity, about the meaning of certain notations on the back of an envelope addressed to his son and postmarked March 27, 1963. The notations included the following apparently disconnected

words: "indictment", "embezzlement", "5 Count GJ", "Mele", "Buffalino Father in Law", "Detroit", and "O'Brien." Petitioner testified that he had never seen the envelope before, did not recognize any of the handwriting, did not understand any connection with Bufalino, and had no recollection of the envelope or any of this (Pet. App. 2a–3a; App. 401–403; Grand Jury Exhibit 1, Government Exhibit at trial 7). The indictment charged that in so answering, petitioner committed perjury (count 2) and that his false and evasive testimony was an obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. 1503 (count 3) (App. 403–406).[1]

The meaning of the notations on the envelope shown to petitioner and their significance and materiality to the grand jury's investigation was shown principally by the testimony of Herbert Itkin, an attorney deeply involved in these matters who had become a government informant. Itkin testified that from the mid-1950's to 1965 he shared office space in New York City with petitioner, who was his accountant. In the fall of 1962, Itkin told petitioner that David Wenger, accountant for the Teamsters' Union, had inquired whether petitioner knew anybody in the Department of Labor with whom they could work out a deal to obtain some information. Petitioner suggested the name of Morris Enamuel (Tr. 30–35). Itkin and petitioner thereafter met with Enamuel and discussed Wenger's problem, which related to embezzlement charges against a union official in Milwaukee (Tr. 35–38).

[1] Count 1 of the indictment, charging petitioner with perjury before the grand jury on another date, resulted in an acquittal.

In March 1963, Itkin and petitioner met with Emanuel about another Teamster matter. Emanuel said that Wenger had insufficiently paid him in the Milwaukee matter, that he had "the top information in the country" and that he wanted to be paid well. In reply to Emanuel's question about where the money would come from, Itkin told him that they were handling a lot of Teamster mortgages and that he would see that Emanuel got paid from the kickback for a loan, which would normally go to the Teamster fund (Tr. 39–41). Two days later, petitioner told Itkin that Emanuel was on his way to San Juan to get information on the matter discussed, which concerned the top Teamster official in Puerto Rico. About a week after that, petitioner told Itkin that Emanuel was promising important information, but wanted a more definite understanding about his remuneration. Itkin responded by promising to see James Hoffa in Florida, at which time he would be in contact with Emanuel through petitioner, who was in New York (Tr. 44–48).

Pursuant to this plan, Itkin went to Florida and met with Hoffa, Wenger and Bill Bufalino. On the following day, Itkin returned to New York and asked petitioner why he had not been available when he called the night before (Tr. 48–50). Petitioner said that he had to go to a very important meeting, but that he had received the information and had given it to his wife. He continued, "Here's what we wrote down and here's what Pearl has down. Let me explain it to you." Petitioner handed him a little envelope

with some information on it and explained that there were five counts against the official in Puerto Rico, including one for a false filing and another for embezzlement. Emanuel had made several suggestions as to how to beat the case, including one about two men in Detroit, Mele and O'Brien, who were said to have something to do with the embezzlement charge. (Bufalino was Mele's father-in-law.) Itkin said he wanted to make a call and asked for the envelope to refresh his memory. Petitioner gave it to him. The same day, Itkin delivered the envelope to the F.B.I. (App. 50–52).

A handwriting expert from the F.B.I. laboratory testified that some of the words on the envelope were definitely in the handwriting of petitioner's wife, while other words contained significant similarities to her writing (Tr. 169–186). Other testimony at trial related to the eventual payment of five hundred dollars by petitioner to Emanuel for his services (Tr. 55–60). Petitioner, testifying in his own behalf, asserted the truth of his grand jury testimony and denied receiving the five hundred dollars (Tr. 254–258).

ARGUMENT

1. Petitioner argues that, since the statute of limitations barred prosecution on the particular malfeasance to which his testimony related, the inquiry was not material to the subject of the grand jury investigation. But the pencilled notations gave objective corroboration to Itkin's account of the relationship that existed in 1963 between certain labor leaders and a

high official in the Department of Labor. If petitioner had truthfully answered questions regarding the significance of the notations, this would have led to other information concerning the activities of Emanuel, who retained his official position until 1968 (App. 275–276, 151–152). As the court of appeals pointed out, "the test of materiality is whether the false testimony has the natural effect or tendency to impede, influence or dissuade the grand jury from pursuing its investigation." *United States* v. *Stone*, 429 F.2d 138, 140 (C.A. 2). This Court has noted, in another context, that "[w]hen the grand jury is performing its investigatory function into a general problem area, without specific regard to indicting a particular individual, society's interest is best served by a thorough and extensive investigation." *Wood* v. *Georgia*, 370 U.S. 375, 392. The investigation here reasonably extended to a matter that, while somewhat remote in time, bore a close relationship to matters of immediate interest to the grand jury. Petitioner had a clear duty to give truthful answers to the questions put to him.

2. Expert testimony that the notations on the envelope were written by petitioner's wife, together with Itkin's possession of the envelope, which was addressed to petitioner's son, furnish sufficient corroboration to the Itkin account. The question of corroboration was submitted to the jury under instructions to which petitioner has not objected (App. 100). See *Weiler* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 606.

3. Petitioner argues that false and evasive testimony before a grand jury cannot amount to an obstruction

of justice under 18 U.S.C. 1503. As the court below noted, the same contention was made and rejected with respect to a charge of impeding an administrative investigation under 18 U.S.C. 1505. *United States* v. *Alo*, 439 F.2d 751 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, October 12, 1971, No. 71-20 this Term.

The omnibus or "catch-all" clause of Section 1503 has been recognized as "broad enough to cover any act, committed corruptly, in an endeavor to impede or obstruct the due administration of justice." *United States* v. *Cohen*, 202 F.Supp. 587, 589 (D. Conn.); see *Falk* v. *United States*, 370 F.2d 472, 476 (C.A. 9), certiorari denied *sub nom. Wunder* v. *United States*, 387 U.S. 926; *Catena* v. *United States*, 176 F.2d 884, 887 (C.A. 9); *United States* v. *Kobrak*, 121 F.2d 333, 335 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 314 U.S. 626; *Samples* v. *United States*, 121 F.2d 263, 265 (C.A. 5); *United States* v. *Solow*, 138 F. Supp. 812, 814-815 (S.D.N.Y.); *United States* v. *Siegel*, 152 F. Supp. 370 (S.D.N.Y.), affirmed, 263 F.2d 530 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 359 U.S. 1012.

This Court held in *In re Michael*, 326 U.S. 224, 229, that perjury before a grand jury, which had to be proved by independent evidence, could not be punished as a contempt. In *United States* v. *Essex*, 407 F.2d 214 (C.A. 6), relied upon by petitioners, the court viewed Section 1503 as a substitute for contempt and applied the *Michael* rationale to a false affidavit filed on a motion for a new trial. The court held that such an affidavit was not an obstruction of justice in the absence of proof that it impeded the court in the con-

duct of its business. Whatever the validity of that decision, it does not apply to this case for here the judge charged the jury that it had to find not only that petitioner gave false and evasive answers but also that he willfully endeavored to influence, obstruct or impede the official inquiry undertaken by the grand jury (Tr. 405–410).

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
Solicitor General.
HENRY E. PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General.
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
KIRBY W. PATTERSON,
Attorneys.

FEBRUARY 1972.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1972